In the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include replacement sheets for those originally filed with the application.

Attachment: Replacement sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 15-19 are amended. No new matter is presented.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the objections to the claims. The claim amendments have been made. Thus, the objections should be withdrawn.

The drawings are subject to an objection as being illegible. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d) are submitted herewith. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is appropriate in view of the corrected drawing sheets.

The claims are subject to obviousness-type double patenting rejections over U.S. Patents 7,542,961 and 7,461,006. A terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith. Accordingly the obviousness-type double patenting rejections may be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6, 8-20 and 22-28 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Szarfman. Claims 7 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Szarfman in view of Classen. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

In the art of medical databases, a longstanding problem when correlating adverse drug effects is reducing the "surrounding background 'noise'." Background noise is responsible for obscuring connections among data elements. (See specification, paragraph [0137].) The claimed invention resolves this problem by selecting a substance of interest, inputting data from various commonly used adverse drug effects reporting databases such as the U.S. FDA's Adverse Event Reporting System (AERS) or Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities (MedDRA), cleaning the data, and profiling the cleaned data. The claimed profiler can compare aspects of the target drug with "concomitant drugs," a concomitant drug being a drug that may or may not be suspected of causing a bad reaction for a patient reported in one of the adverse reporting databases. (See specification, paragraph [0123].) Until applicant made the claimed invention, other efforts at

reducing "background noise" as disclosed in applicant's specification were unsuccessful because raw data from adverse effects reporting databases included an overload of verbatim information. Previous attempts at removing verbatim information failed because data was not "cleaned" sufficiently before mining the data. Insufficient cleaning resulted in poor or inaccurate analysis of a drug's effects.

The claims as amended clarify that the claimed invention maintains a consistent vocabulary, thus reducing or eliminating the verbatim information problem as described in the preceding paragraphs. Specifically, the claims recite a method for displaying assessment and analysis of the risks of adverse effects resulting from use of at least one substance of interest, in part, comprising "maintaining a consistent vocabulary by processing a vector comprising a plurality of categorical terms," "wherein the plurality of categorical terms are therapeutic categories."

Szarfman fails to teach the claim limitations. Instead, Szarfman merely teaches "a derived database of signal scores." (See Szarfman, page 39.) Szarfman teaches a database of all distinct counts of event and drug combinations. (See Szarfman, page 33.) However, nowhere does Szarfman teach maintaining a consistent vocabulary by processing a vector comprising a plurality of categorical terms.

An advantage of the claimed invention is that it can maintain a consistent vocabulary for categorical terms by removing the "background noise" from the raw data contained in the U.S. FDA's Adverse Event Reporting System (AERS) or Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities (MedDRA). (See specification, paragraph [0140].) The claimed invention permits the sorting, comparing, and handling of thousands of cases, which was not available in the prior art. (See specification, paragraph [0140].) Since Szarfman fails to teach all of the elements of claims 1 and 15, the rejections under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the claims in this application is in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **597932000200**.

Dated: July 27, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Adam Keser, Reg. No. 54,217
For Peter J. Davis
Registration No.: 36,119
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7748

Attachments